
Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature



Project Resourcing & Schedule

Management System

Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

March 1, 2009 – May 31, 2009



California Department of Transportation

Division of Project Management

Office of Statewide Project Management Improvement

Table of Contents

Independent Project Oversight Reports	1
IPO Report for May, 2009	1
Project Oversight Review Checklist for May, 2009	7
IPO Report for April, 2009	11
Project Oversight Review Checklist for April, 2009	16
IPO Report for March, 2009	20
Project Oversight Review Checklist for March, 2009	25

Independent Project Oversight Reports

IPO Report for May 2009

Project Name: Caltrans PRSM

Assessment Date: May 29, 2009

Frequency: Monthly

Oversight Provider Information

Oversight Leader: Greg Thomas

Organization: Deloitte & Touche LLP

Phone Number: 916 288 3232

Email: grethomas@deloitte.com

Project Information

Project Number: 2660-160

Department: Transportation (Caltrans)

Criticality: High

Agency: Business, Transportation & Housing

Last Approved Document/Date: SPR (09/29/08)

Total One-time Cost: \$26,119,068

Start Date: June 7, 2000

End Date: January 6, 2011

Project Manager: David Youmans

Organization: Caltrans

Phone Number: 916.826.4425

Email: david_youmans@dot.ca.gov

Summary: Current Status

Project Phase: Planning

Planned Start Date: September 2, 2008

Planned End Date: October 6, 2008

Actual Start Date: March 5, 2009

Forecasted End Date: July 8, 2009

Schedule

Select the statement that most closely applies, measured against the last **Finance approved** document.

Ahead-of-schedule:

One or more major tasks or milestones have been completed and approved early (> 5%).
All other major tasks and milestones completed and approved according to plan.

On Schedule

On-schedule:

All major tasks and milestones have been completed and approved according to plan.
(Within 5%)

Behind Schedule:

One or more major tasks or milestones are expected to be delayed. (> 5%)

Comments:

A new baseline schedule was set with the approved SPR dated September 29, 2008. The SPR states the start date of the Planning Phase as September 2, 2008, however, the final contract was signed by the Implementation Vendor on February 26, 2009. Caltrans received, reviewed and signed

Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

the contract on February 27, 2009. DGS Legal reviewed and signed the contract on March 5th, 2009. The current SPR appears to be inconsistent with the new actual dates. Based on conversations with the Caltrans PRSM IT Project Manager, an updated SPR with a new baseline has been drafted and discussed with the OCIO. The draft SPR has been submitted to the Caltrans PMO office for review. The updated SPR will more accurately reflect the actual start date of the contract.

Based on the draft SPR and information distributed during the PRSM kick-off meeting, the Planning Phase was forecasted to end in May 2009. In the May 26, 2009 PRSM Project Status meeting, the Implementation Vendor identified the Planning Phase completion date as July 8, 2009. This represents a difference of two months. Based on conversations with the Caltrans PRSM Project Manager, the PRSM Project Team plans on completing activities scheduled for the Adaptation Phase (the phase after Planning) in parallel with activities in the Planning Phase. At this point in time, the PRSM Project Team does not anticipate the two month delay in the Planning Phase to affect the completion date of the entire project. Based on this information, IPOC has reported the project as "On Schedule", however, we will continue to closely monitor the Planning Phase status and start dates of parallel tasks in the Adaptation Phase.

Resources (Level of Effort) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Fewer Resources

Completion of one or more major tasks and/or acceptable products has required or is expected to require materially (>5%) fewer hours/staff than planned.

Within Resources

All major tasks have been completed and acceptable products created using the planned number of hours/staff (within 5%).

Within Resources

More Resources

Completion of major tasks and/or acceptable products has required or is expected to require materially (>5%) more hours/staff than planned.

Comments: A new baseline was set with the approved SPR.

Resources (Budget/Cost) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Less cost

The project is (>5%) under budget.

Within cost

The project is operating within budget.

Within Cost

Higher cost

Material budget increases (>5%) are likely.

Comments: A new baseline was set with the approved SPR.

Quality (Client Functionality) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Adequately Defined

Required client functionality is adequately defined, and is being successfully built into the system, given the current project phase.

Adequately Defined

Inadequately Defined

One or more significant components of required client functionality are inadequately defined, or are not being successfully built into the system, given the current project phase.

Comments: Functionality is adequately defined for the Planning Phase which began on March 5, 2009. The Implementation Vendor is currently reviewing the requirements and will be working with Caltrans to create a requirements clarification report, which is due to be completed in June, 2009.

Quality (Architecture/System Performance) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Adequately Defined

Adequately Defined

The system technical architecture is adequately defined, and modeling, benchmarking and testing are being conducted (or are planned) appropriate to the current project phase.

Inadequately Defined

The system technical architecture is not adequately defined, or modeling, benchmarking and testing are not being conducted (or are planned) appropriate to the current project phase.

Comments: System technical architecture and performance are adequately defined for the Planning Phase. The Implementation Vendor is working with Caltrans to create a Configuration Management Plan and High Level Design. Caltrans and the Implementation Vendor are working with DTS to configure the development, testing and training environments. As the project progresses, additional refinement may be necessary.

New Risks

No new risks this month.

Progress Toward Addressing Prior Risks

Risk Title: Timing of Interfaces

Risk Statement: With a new Caltrans financial systems project underway (ERP Financial Infrastructure – “EFIS”), an additional interface will need to be developed. The PRSM project is currently planning to develop an interface to the Caltrans Financial Data to Oracle (FIDO) system, which is the Caltrans enterprise financial system that is currently used for operations. The timing for development of the EFIS interface is tentatively planned for September 2009, although the specifications and data requirements are not fully documented at this time. The uncertainties associated with the EFIS interface may have an impact on development and testing resources (potentially increasing development and testing costs) and a potential adverse impact on the project schedule (delay in development of the PRSM solution).

Probability: High Impact: Medium Time Frame: Short Term Severity: High Assigned to: Jacqueline Moore

Recommendations:

- Continue to work closely with the EFIS project by attending the bi-weekly interface planning meetings. Escalate issues related to EFIS timing and resource needs to the PRSM Steering Committee for resolution as soon as the interface requirements are finalized.

Status Update:

May 09 Status: The PRSM team is currently attending bi-weekly meetings with the EFIS project team to discuss the interface requirements and plan for development of the interface. Two items on the PRSM Project Plan regarding interfaces were moved out of the Planning Phase and will be placed in a more appropriate phase, when the interface points will be more stable. The two items were: Develop Baseline Interface Design Specification and Interface Modeled into Business Process.

April 09 Status: The PRSM team is currently attending bi-weekly meetings with the EFIS project team to discuss the interface requirements and plan for development of the interface.

Risk Title: Resource Availability

Risk Statement: Without adequate Caltrans resources working on PRSM, the project implementation schedule could be delayed. While in the Planning Phase, some of the PRSM Project Team members are allocated part time. The resource needs are likely to change when the project shifts to the Implementation Phase.

Probability: Medium Impact: High Time Frame: Short Severity: High Assigned to: TBD

Recommendations:

- After the PRSM work plan is complete, determine the resource gaps and reallocate effort as appropriate.

Status Update:

May 09 Status: As part of the Planning Phase of the project and in conjunction with the Implementation Vendor, the PRSM Project Team will establish possible changes to resource needs and roles/responsibilities. On May 19, 2009, the Implementation Vendor requested different critical path resources for the following functions: Configuration, Interfaces, and Data Conversion. The Business Project Manager is still acting as the interim publicity /communications manager until the position can be filled.

April 09 Status: As part of the Planning Phase of the project and in conjunction with the Implementation Vendor, the PRSM Project Team will establish possible changes to resource needs and roles/responsibilities. Since the Planning Phase is underway, it is too early to determine if a significant change in Caltrans PRSM resource assignments will be necessary. Currently, the Business Project Manager is acting as the interim publicity/communications manager until the position can be filled.

Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Risk Title: Business Rules and Business Process Changes

Risk Statement: The impact of business changes resulting from the PRSM implementation needs to be sufficiently understood, planned for, and communicated to Caltrans staff. If District field staff are not in agreement with the decisions and consequences of changing/standardizing business rules and business processes, it may have an adverse effect on system acceptance and may disrupt work in progress. This could result in increased resistance to acceptance and usage of the system.

Please note that this risk was documented in the previous IPOR's as 2 separate risks: "Business Rules" and "Business Process Changes". Beginning in this IPOR and going forward, these risks have been consolidated.

Probability: High Impact: High Time Frame: Med Severity: High Assigned to: David Cordone

Recommendations:

- Implement a formal change management process which will be used for PRSM project related changes. Change management tasks associated with these changes should be incorporated into the project schedule and budget. Changes should be communicated to the key stakeholders.
- Define the process for gaining field consensus on the new business rules and business processes.
- Develop a plan that describes how information on new business rules and business processes will be communicated to the field with sufficient time to get feedback and buy-in.

Status Update:

May 09 Status: The Implementation Vendor is completing their review of the "to be" business process documents. Once the "to be" business process documents have been released to the Districts, a video conference will be scheduled with each District individually to discuss the final processes and rules as well as address any District concerns. PRSM Task Management and Reporting continue to be the key areas that need to be addressed from a business process standpoint.

April 09 Status: As part of the Planning Phase and in conjunction with the Implementation vendor, the PRSM team is going through a process to take the planned "to be" business processes and work the CA Clarity Project Management tool (the tool selected as the PRSM solution) in order to identify gaps. As these gaps are identified and consolidated, there will be a process to obtain feedback from the Districts. Currently, the PRSM Project Team is preparing to release the final version of the "to be" business process documents to the Districts. Once they have been released, a video conference will be scheduled with each District individually to discuss the final processes as well as address any District concerns. PRSM Task Management and Reporting continue to be the key areas that need to be addressed from a business process standpoint.

General Comments

Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Deloitte & Touche LLP's IPOC contract with the Caltrans PRSM project started in December 2008. This Independent Project Oversight Report (IPOR) provided by Deloitte & Touche LLP has been developed in accordance with the applicable standards of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) as per Deloitte & Touche LLP policy.

IPOC has attended various PRSM project meetings throughout the month of May, including the PRSM Implementation Managers meeting and the PRSM Status meetings.

At the end of this reporting period, the PRSM project is in the Planning Phase of the project. Three deliverables have been identified to be completed during the Planning Phase: the Implementation Plan, Training Plan, and Configuration Management Plan. IPOC will review each of the plans and provide comments after they have been drafted and deemed ready for review.

Beginning in this reporting period, PRSM project status meetings have been occurring on a weekly basis versus bi-weekly. During the status meetings, the Implementation Vendor distributes an updated status report, which includes an updated schedule in Microsoft Project for the Planning Phase. The schedule provides a detailed view of the status of activities, deliverables, and milestones for the Planning Phase. In addition, the status report also includes a Past Due Task Status Register and an Action Item / Decision Register. Additional phase schedules will be created and distributed as the project progresses into the subsequent phases. The Implementation Plan deliverable in Payment Point 1 will encompass the complete project schedule.

Based on conversations with the Caltrans PRSM IT Project Manager, an updated SPR with a new baseline is being drafted. Based on the draft SPR and information distributed during the PRSM Kick-off meeting, the Planning Phase was forecasted to end in May 2009. In the May 26, 2009 PRSM Project Status meeting, the Implementation Vendor identified the Planning Phase completion date as July 8, 2009. This represents a difference of two months. Based on conversations with the Caltrans PRSM Project Manager, although the Planning Phase schedule has been extended by two months, the PRSM Project Team plan on completing several activities in parallel. For more information, please refer to the Schedule section of Page 1 of this IPOR.

Key activities during the Planning Phase include development and approval of the Implementation, Training and Configuration Management Plans, and installation of the CA Clarity Hardware and Software environments at the Department of Technology Services (DTS). In addition to the key activities, during this reporting period, the Implementation Vendor submitted a Draft Communications Plan for the PRSM Project Team to review. Feedback and comments were collected by the PRSM Project Team and submitted to the Implementation Vendor. Currently, the Implementation Vendor is in the process of reviewing the comments and incorporating the feedback into an updated Draft Communications Plan.

As of May 29, 2009, the following Planning Phase work items below are noted as being Past Due and are being tracked by IPOC:

1. 'To Be' Business Process Refinement – The 'to be' process refinement effort was delayed by a week due to an Implementation Vendor Consultant illness. The Implementation Vendor is currently in the process of completing this activity.
2. DTS Hardware Installation – There were two issues associated with the PRSM server at DTS that created a delay in getting the development environment fully operational: An unsupported Operating System version was installed at DTS and access to certain network ports were closed. Currently, DTS has resolved those issues and the Software Vendor Consultant is in the process of configuring three instances of PRSM: Development, Test, and Training.
3. Rollout Order – The PRSM District rollout order has not been finalized. The rollout order will consist of seven "clusters" of sites; however, the order of those clusters has not yet been identified.

Please note that while these items are Past Due, IPOC's current assessment is that their status will not impact the "On Schedule" assessment on page 1 of this report.

Project Oversight Review Checklist for May 2009

Project Oversight Review Checklist: High Criticality Project

This checklist is an assessment for the Planning Phase. The end date of this phase is July 2009.

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Planning and Tracking			
Have the business case, project goals, objectives, expected outcomes, key stakeholders, and sponsor(s) identified and documented?	X		The SPR was approved by the OCIO on September 29, 2008. The Section 11 was submitted and the waiting period ended Dec 5. The appropriate project documents should be updated with the new information from the SPR and Implementation Vendor information. An updated SPR with a new baseline has been drafted and discussed with the OCIO. The draft SPR has been submitted to the Caltrans PMO office for review.
Has a detailed project plan with all activities (tasks), milestones, dates, and estimated hours by task loaded into project management (PM) software? Are the lowest level tasks of a short duration with measurable outcomes?	X		During the Planning Phase, the Implementation Vendor is working with Caltrans to update the detailed project plan in MS Project to more accurately reflect and track project tasks, milestones, dates, and estimated hours. The Planning Phase WBS with approximately 60 tasks has been entered in MS Project. An overall project WBS/task list of approximately 2,000 items exists in an Excel file. These activities are appropriate for the Planning Phase of the project.
Is completion of planned tasks recorded within the PM software?	X		During the Planning Phase, the Implementation Vendor is working with Caltrans to update the detailed project plan in MS Project to more accurately track completion of planned tasks. This is appropriate for the Planning Phase of the project.
Are actual hours expended by task recorded at least monthly within PM software?	X		Actual hours are charged to a WBS number and are recorded and tracked in the Department's official accounting system.
Are estimated hours to complete by task recorded at least monthly within PM software?		X	For the Planning Phase the project has begun to track estimated hours to complete in MS Project. Estimated hours to complete are currently not being recorded within PM software for the overall PRSM WBS. A draft WBS work plan for the entire project is being created which will be used going forward to track tasks, estimated hours, dependencies, and resources. The PRSM Project Team is planning to use the PM software that was proposed in the Implementation Vendor's contract (MS Project).
Is there a formal staffing plan, including a current organization chart, written roles and responsibilities, plans for staff acquisition, schedule for arrival and departure of specific staff, and staff training plans		X	The project organization has changed and applicable documents should be updated.
Have project cost estimates, with supporting data for each cost category, been maintained?	X		The latest approved SPR dated September 29, 2008 has reset the baseline.
Are software size estimates developed and tracked?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase and this item will be assessed as the new WBS is developed.
Are two or more estimation approaches used to refine estimates?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase and this item will be assessed as the new WBS is

Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
			developed.
Are independent reviews of estimates conducted?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase and this item will be assessed as the new WBS is developed.
Are actual costs recorded and regularly compared to budgeted costs?	X		A spreadsheet exists that shows planned and actual costs by month.
Is supporting data maintained for actual costs?	X		Actual costs are obtained from timesheets that allocate time to WBS numbers/tasks.
Is completion status of work plan activities, deliverables, and milestones recorded, compared to schedule and included in a written status reporting process?	X		Beginning in this reporting period, PRSM project status meetings have been occurring on a weekly basis versus bi-weekly. During the meetings, the Implementation Vendor distributes an updated status report, which includes an updated schedule in MS Project for the Planning Phase. The schedule provides a detailed view of the status of activities, deliverables, and milestones for the Planning Phase. In addition, the status report also includes a Past Due Task Status Register and an Action Item / Decision Register. A high-level status report is posted on the Caltrans Improvement Project web database. Status reports go to the Legislature quarterly.
Are key specification documents (e.g. contracts, requirement specifications and/or contract deliverables) and software products under formal configuration control, with items to be controlled and specific staff roles and responsibilities for configuration management identified in a configuration management plan?	X		The development of the Configuration Management Plan is a deliverable that will be created in the Planning Phase. Currently, the vendor and Caltrans are working together to develop this plan. Once the Configuration Management Plan is drafted, IPOC will review the plan and provide comments.
Are issues/problems and their resolution (including assignment of specific staff responsibility for issue resolution and specific deadlines for completion of resolution activities), formally tracked?	X		An Issue Management Plan was approved and open issues are in the project database. The IT project manager is considering the same tool for managing project changes. Additionally, Caltrans has established an Issues Management Meeting that is held on a monthly basis.
Is user satisfaction assessed at key project milestones?	X		Representatives of the engineering areas and regions participated in the vendor demonstration evaluations. This is adequate for the Planning Phase of the project.
Is planning in compliance with formal standards or a system development life-cycle (SDLC) methodology?	X		Compliance with PMBOK standards is adequate for this phase of the project. Three deliverables have been identified to be completed during the Planning Phase: the Implementation Plan, Training Plan, and Configuration Management Plan.
Is there formal enterprise architecture in place?	X		The RFQI describes the target Caltrans enterprise environment.
Are project closeout activities performed, including a PIER, collection and archiving up-to-date project records and identification of lessons learned?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase.
Procurement			
Are appropriate procurement vehicles selected (e.g. CMAS, MSA, "alternative procurement") and their required processes followed?	X		The final contract was signed by the Implementation Vendor on February 26, 2009. Caltrans received, reviewed and signed the contract on February 27, 2009. DGS Legal reviewed and signed the contract on March 5th, 2009.
Is a detailed written scope of work for all services included in solicitation documents?	X		Detailed written scope of work is contained in the RFP.
Are detailed requirement specifications included in solicitation documents?	X		Detailed requirement specifications are contained in the RFP. Requirements are described in the RFQI and Value Analysis documents.

Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Is there material participation of outside expertise (e.g. DGS, Departmental specialists, consultants) in procurement planning and execution?	X		Outside expertise and counsel has been sought from DOF, DGS, and consultants.
For large-scale outsourcing, is qualified legal counsel obtained?	N/A	N/A	The project does not involve outsourcing as currently defined.
Risk Management			
Is formal continuous risk management performed, including development of a written risk management plan, identification, analysis, mitigation and escalation of risks in accordance with DOF/TOSU Guidelines, and regular management team review of risks and mitigation progress performed?	X		The latest version of the Risk Management Plan was submitted April 30, 2009. Risk owners have been assigned. A Risk Register was developed and is tracked by the Risk Manager.
Does the management team review risks and mitigation progress at least monthly?	X		Risk management sessions are being held regularly with the team during the procurement phase.
Are externally developed risk identification aids used, such as the SEI Taxonomy Based Questionnaire?	X		A risk list was initially populated using the SEI Risk Taxonomy. Additional risks are added to the list through input or migration from the issue list.
Communication			
Is there a written project communications plan?	X		The Communication Plan was updated to reflect the new organization and implementation strategy. The updated Communication Plan is dated November 2008. A new draft PRSM Communications Matrix was sent out on April 30, 2009 for review. During this reporting period, the Implementation Vendor submitted a Draft Communications Plan for the PRSM Project Team to review. Feedback and comments were collected by the PRSM Project Team and submitted to the Implementation Vendor. Currently, the Implementation Vendor is in the process of reviewing the comments and incorporating the feedback into an updated Draft Communications Plan.
Are regular written status reports prepared and provided to the project manager, department CIO (if applicable) and other key stakeholders?	X		The Advisory Committee receives a written status report during the monthly Advisory Committee meetings. These reports include issues identified, changes to scope, schedule, cost, problems encountered, and items accomplished.
Are there written escalation policies for issues and risks?	X		Both the Risk Management Plan and the Issue Management Plan contain a risk escalation process.
Is there regular stakeholder involvement in major project decisions, issue resolution and risk mitigation?	X		Implementation Manager meetings occur on a monthly basis. The purpose of this meeting is to keep the District project managers regularly updated on the status of the project and to receive their input.
System Engineering			
Are users involved throughout the project, especially in requirements specification and testing?	X		Representatives of key stakeholder groups participated in and reviewed the Value Analysis Report that describes the PRSM requirements. The PRSM Project Team is being run by Caltrans Division of Project management which is the primary constituency for the system.
Do users formally approve/sign-off on written specifications?	X		The PRSM Advisory Committee is comprised of Caltrans personnel. The Advisory Committee appears to be monitoring the initial planning process. This

Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
			level of involvement appears to be appropriate for the current phase of the project.
Is a formal SDLC methodology followed?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase and this item will be assessed as the Configuration Management Plan and new WBS is near completion.
Is a software product used to assist in managing requirements? Is there tracking of requirements traceability through all life-cycle phases?	X		An Implementation and System Acceptance Test consultant has been added to the team. The level of requirements management presently in place appears to be appropriate for the current phase of the project.
Do software engineering standards exist and are they followed?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase
Does product defect tracking begin no later than requirements specifications?	X		The PRSM issue management system currently is designed to serve as a defect tracking mechanism. Several of the issues already raised represent clarification to requirements.
Are formal code reviews conducted?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase
Are formal quality assurance procedures followed consistently?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase
Do users sign-off on acceptance test results before a new system or changes are put into production?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase
Is the enterprise architecture plan adhered to?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase and this item will be assessed as the plans are near completion.
Are formal deliverable inspections performed, beginning with requirements specifications?	X		During the Planning Phase, the Implementation Vendor is reviewing the requirements and will be working with Caltrans to create a requirements clarification report. Previously, the requirements have been through two separate review activities: user group review and IV&V review. There is a third review underway by the Project Management team in order to document the As-Is and To-Be business processes. IPOC will continue to monitor this area as the project progresses.
Are IV&V services obtained and used?	X		The IV&V Contract was approved and the IV&V vendor began work in April 2008.

IPO Report for April 2009

Independent Project Oversight Report

Project Name: Caltrans PRSM

Assessment Date: April 30, 2009

Frequency: Monthly

Oversight Provider Information

Oversight Leader: Greg Thomas

Organization: Deloitte & Touche LLP

Phone Number: 916 288 3232

Email: grethomas@deloitte.com

Project Information

Project Number: 2660-160

Department: Transportation (Caltrans)

Criticality: High

Agency: Business, Transportation & Housing

Last Approved Document/Date: SPR (09/29/08)

Total One-time Cost: \$25,544,000

Start Date: June 7, 2000

End Date: May, 2011

Project Manager: David Youmans

Organization: Caltrans

Phone Number: 916.826.4425

Email: david_youmans@dot.ca.gov

Summary: Current Status

Project Phase: Planning

Planned Start Date: September 2, 2008

Planned End Date: October 6, 2008

Actual Start Date: March 5, 2009

Forecasted End Date: July, 2009

Schedule

Select the statement that most closely applies, measured against the last **Finance approved** document.

Ahead-of-schedule:

One or more major tasks or milestones have been completed and approved early (> 5%).
All other major tasks and milestones completed and approved according to plan.

On Schedule

On-schedule:

All major tasks and milestones have been completed and approved according to plan.
(Within 5%)

Behind Schedule:

One or more major tasks or milestones are expected to be delayed. (> 5%)

Comments:

A new baseline schedule was set with the approved SPR dated September 29, 2008. The final contract was signed by the Implementation Vendor on February 26, 2009. Caltrans received,

Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

reviewed and signed the contract on February 27, 2009. DGS Legal reviewed and signed the contract on March 5th, 2009. The implementation vendor kick-off meeting was held on March 9, 2009. During the kick-off meeting, the PRSM Project Team provided the implementation vendor with overviews of the current PRSM project management plans. An updated SPR with a new baseline is being drafted. Caltrans is meeting with the OCIO to discuss the updated SPR's content.

Resources (Level of Effort) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Fewer Resources

Completion of one or more major tasks and/or acceptable products has required or is expected to require materially (>5%) fewer hours/staff than planned.

Within Resources

All major tasks have been completed and acceptable products created using the planned number of hours/staff (within 5%).

Within Resources

More Resources

Completion of major tasks and/or acceptable products has required or is expected to require materially (>5%) more hours/staff than planned.

Comments: A new baseline was set with the approved SPR.

Resources (Budget/Cost) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Less cost

The project is (>5%) under budget.

Within cost

The project is operating within budget.

Within Cost

Higher cost

Material budget increases (>5%) are likely.

Comments: A new baseline was set with the approved SPR.

Quality (Client Functionality) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Adequately Defined

Required client functionality is adequately defined, and is being successfully built into the system, given the current project phase.

Adequately Defined

Inadequately Defined

One or more significant components of required client functionality are inadequately defined, or are not being successfully built into the system, given the current project phase.

Comments: Functionality is adequately defined for the Planning Phase which began on March 5. The Implementation Vendor is currently reviewing the requirements and will be working with Caltrans to create a requirements clarification report, which is due to be completed in May, 2009.

Quality (Architecture/System Performance) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Adequately Defined

The system technical architecture is adequately defined, and modeling, benchmarking and testing are being conducted (or are planned) appropriate to the current project phase.

Adequately Defined

Inadequately Defined

The system technical architecture is not adequately defined, or modeling, benchmarking and testing are not being conducted (or are planned) appropriate to the current project phase.

Comments: System technical architecture and performance are adequately defined for the Planning Phase. The Implementation Vendor is working with Caltrans to create a Configuration Management Plan and High Level Design. Caltrans and the Implementation Vendor are working with DTS to configure the development, testing and training environments. As the project progresses, additional refinement may be necessary.

New Risks

Risk Title: Timing of Interfaces

Risk Statement: With a new Caltrans financial systems project underway (ERP Financial Infrastructure – “EFIS”), an additional interface will need to be developed. The PRSM project is currently planning to develop an interface to the Caltrans Financial Data to Oracle (FIDO) system, which is the Caltrans enterprise financial system that is currently used for operations. The timing for development of the EFIS interface is tentatively planned for September 2009, although the specifications and data requirements are not fully documented at this time. The uncertainties associated with the EFIS interface may have an impact on development and testing resources (potentially increasing development and testing costs) and a potential adverse impact on the project schedule (delay in development of the PRSM solution).

Probability: High Impact: Medium Time Frame: Short Term Severity: High Assigned to: Jacqueline Moore

Recommendations:

- Continue to work closely with the EFIS project by attending the bi-weekly interface planning meetings. Escalate issues related to EFIS timing and resource needs to the PRSM Steering Committee for resolution as soon as the interface requirements are finalized.

Status Update:

April 09 Status: The PRSM team is currently attending bi-weekly meetings with the EFIS project team to discuss the interface requirements and plan for development of the interface.

Progress Toward Addressing Prior Risks

Risk Title: Resource Availability

Risk Statement: Without adequate Caltrans resources working on PRSM, the project implementation schedule could be delayed. While in the Planning Phase, some of the PRSM Project Team members are allocated part time. The resource needs are likely to change when the project shifts to the implementation phase.

Probability: Medium Impact: High Time Frame: Short Severity: High Assigned to: TBD

Recommendations:

- After the PRSM work plan is complete, determine the resource gaps and reallocate effort as appropriate.

Status Update:

April 09 Status: As part of the Planning Phase of the project and in conjunction with the Implementation Vendor, the PRSM Project Team will establish possible changes to resource needs and roles/responsibilities. Since the Planning Phase is underway, it is too early to determine if a significant change in Caltrans PRSM resource assignments will be necessary. Currently, the business project manager is acting as the interim publicity/communications manager until the position can be filled.

March 09 Status: The PRSM Project Team WBS work plan comments and feedback continue to be collected and reviewed. The PRSM Publicity/Risk Manager has left the project team and a replacement has not yet been identified.

Risk Title: Business Process Changes

Risk Statement: The impact of business changes resulting from the PRSM implementation needs to be sufficiently understood, planned for, and communicated to Caltrans staff. If this is not addressed, the project rollout could result in disruption to the business processes and create issues regarding the perceived quality of PRSM. This could result in increased resistance to acceptance and usage of the system.

Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Probability: High

Impact: High

Time Frame: Med

Severity: High

Assigned to: David Cordone

Recommendations:

- Implement a formal change management process which will be used for PRSM project related changes. Change management tasks associated with these changes should be incorporated into the project schedule and budget. Changes should be communicated to the key stakeholders.

Status Update:

April 09 Status: As part of the Planning Phase and in conjunction with the Implementation vendor, the PRSM team is going through a process to take the planned “to be” business processes and work the CA Clarity Project Management tool (the tool selected as the PRSM solution) in order to identify gaps. As these gaps are identified and consolidated, there will be a process to obtain feedback from the Districts. Currently, the PRSM Project Team is preparing to release the final version of the “to be” business process documents to the districts. Once they have been released, a video conference will be scheduled with each district individually to discuss the final processes as well as address any district concerns. PRSM Task Management and Reporting continue to be the key areas that need to be addressed from a business process standpoint.

March 09 Status: The business project managers have reported that the draft business process documentation was sent to the Districts for review. District feedback has been collected and the project team is now in the process of incorporating the District’s comments. Once District comments have been incorporated, the documentation will go through a Management review.

Risk Title: Business Rules

Risk Statement: If District field staff are not in agreement with the decisions and consequences of changing/standardizing business rules, it may have an adverse effect on system acceptance and may disrupt work in progress. If PRSM intends to standardize business rules, the decisions and consequences of changing/standardizing business rules should be documented, communicated, clearly understood and agreed to by the Districts prior to implementation.

Probability: High Impact: High

Time Frame: Med

Severity: High

Assigned to: David Cordone

Recommendations:

- Define the process for gaining field consensus on the new business rules.
- Develop a plan that describes how information on new business rules will be communicated to the field with sufficient time to get feedback and buy-in. This business rule information should inform test case development.

Status Update:

April 09 Status: As part of the Planning Phase and in conjunction with the Implementation vendor, the PRSM team is going through a process to take the planned “to be” business processes and work the CA Clarity Project Management tool (the tool selected as the PRSM solution) in order to identify gaps. As these gaps are identified and consolidated, there will be a process to obtain feedback from the Districts. This feedback will include business rules and business processes. Currently, the PRSM Project Team is preparing to release the final version of the “to be” business process documents to the districts. Once they have been released, a video conference will be scheduled with each district individually to discuss the final processes and rules as well as address any district concerns.

March 09 Status: The business project managers have reported that the draft business process documentation was sent to the Districts for review. District feedback has been collected and the project team is now in the process of incorporating the District’s comments. Once District comments have been incorporated, the documentation will go through a Management review

General Comments

Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Deloitte & Touche LLP's IPOC contract with the Caltrans PRSM project started in December 2008. This Independent Project Oversight Report (IPOR) provided by Deloitte & Touche LLP has been developed in accordance with the applicable standards of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) as per Deloitte & Touche LLP policy.

IPOC has attended various PRSM project meetings throughout the month of April, including the PRSM Implementation Managers meeting, PRSM Status meetings, and the PRSM Advisory Committee meeting. In addition, IPOC met with three members of the PRSM Advisory Committee in the month of April to get stakeholder perspectives on the project.

At the end of this reporting period, the PRSM project is in the Planning Phase of the project. Three deliverables have been identified to be completed during the Planning Phase: the Implementation Plan, Training Plan, and Configuration Management Plan. IPOC will review each of the plans and provide comments after they have been drafted. The current Planning Phase detailed Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) shows a completion date of July 16, 2009. Key activities during the Planning Phase include development and approval of the Implementation, Training and Configuration Management Plans, and installation of the CA Clarity Hardware and Software environments at the Department of Technology Services (DTS).

Project Oversight Review Checklist for April 2009

Project Oversight Review Checklist: High Criticality Project

This checklist is an assessment for the Planning Phase. The end date of this phase is July 2009.

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Planning and Tracking			
Have the business case, project goals, objectives, expected outcomes, key stakeholders, and sponsor(s) identified and documented?	X		The SPR was approved by the OCIO on September 29, 2008. The Section 11 was submitted and the waiting period ended Dec 5. The appropriate project documents should be updated with the new information from the SPR and Implementation Vendor information.
Has a detailed project plan with all activities (tasks), milestones, dates, and estimated hours by task loaded into project management (PM) software? Are the lowest level tasks of a short duration with measurable outcomes?	X		During the Planning Phase, the Implementation Vendor is working with Caltrans to update the detailed project plan in MS Project to more accurately reflect and track project tasks, milestones, dates, and estimated hours. The Planning Phase WBS with approximately 60 tasks has been entered in MS Project. An overall project WBS/task list of approximately 2,000 items exists in an Excel file. These activities are appropriate for the Planning Phase of the project.
Is completion of planned tasks recorded within the PM software?	X		During the Planning Phase, the Implementation Vendor is working with Caltrans to update the detailed project plan in MS Project to more accurately track completion of planned tasks. This is appropriate for the Planning Phase of the project.
Are actual hours expended by task recorded at least monthly within PM software?	X		Actual hours are charged to a WBS number and are recorded and tracked in the Department's official accounting system.
Are estimated hours to complete by task recorded at least monthly within PM software?		X	For the Planning Phase the project has begun to track estimated hours to complete in MS Project. Estimated hours to complete are currently not being recorded within PM software for the overall PRSM WBS. A draft WBS work plan for the entire project is being created which will be used going forward to track tasks, estimated hours, dependencies, and resources. The PRSM Project Team is planning to use the PM software that was proposed in the Implementation Vendor's contract (MS Project).
Is there a formal staffing plan, including a current organization chart, written roles and responsibilities, plans for staff acquisition, schedule for arrival and departure of specific staff, and staff training plans		X	The project organization has changed and applicable documents should be updated.
Have project cost estimates, with supporting data for each cost category, been maintained?	X		The latest approved SPR dated September 29, 2008 has reset the baseline.

Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Are software size estimates developed and tracked?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase and this item will be assessed as the new WBS is developed.
Are two or more estimation approaches used to refine estimates?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase and this item will be assessed as the new WBS is developed.
Are independent reviews of estimates conducted?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase and this item will be assessed as the new WBS is developed.
Are actual costs recorded and regularly compared to budgeted costs?	X		A spreadsheet exists that shows planned and actual costs by month.
Is supporting data maintained for actual costs?	X		Actual costs are obtained from timesheets that allocate time to WBS numbers/tasks.
Is completion status of work plan activities, deliverables, and milestones recorded, compared to schedule and included in a written status reporting process?	X		High-level work plan activity completion is reported in status meetings and is documented in Excel. The Implementation Vendor is currently working with Caltrans to update the detailed project plan in MS Project. This plan will be used to track completion of activities, deliverables, and milestones. A high-level status report is posted on the Caltrans Improvement Project web database. Status reports go to the Legislature quarterly.
Are key specification documents (e.g. contracts, requirement specifications and/or contract deliverables) and software products under formal configuration control, with items to be controlled and specific staff roles and responsibilities for configuration management identified in a configuration management plan?	X		The development of the Configuration Management Plan is a deliverable that will be created in the Planning Phase. Currently, the vendor and Caltrans are working together to develop this plan. Once the Configuration Management Plan is drafted, IPOC will review the plan and provide comments.
Are issues/problems and their resolution (including assignment of specific staff responsibility for issue resolution and specific deadlines for completion of resolution activities), formally tracked?	X		An Issue Management Plan was approved and open issues are in the project database. The IT project manager is considering the same tool for managing project changes. Additionally, Caltrans has established an Issues Management Meeting that is held on a monthly basis.
Is user satisfaction assessed at key project milestones?	X		Representatives of the engineering areas and regions participated in the vendor demonstration evaluations. This is adequate for the Planning Phase of the project.
Is planning in compliance with formal standards or a system development life-cycle (SDLC) methodology?	X		Compliance with PMBOK standards is adequate for this phase of the project. Three deliverables have been identified to be completed during the Planning Phase: the Implementation Plan, Training Plan, and Configuration Management Plan.
Is there formal enterprise architecture in place?	X		The RFQI describes the target Caltrans enterprise environment.
Are project closeout activities performed, including a PIER, collection and archiving up-to-date project records and identification of lessons learned?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase.
Procurement			
Are appropriate procurement vehicles selected (e.g. CMAS, MSA, "alternative procurement") and their required processes followed?	X		The final contract was signed by the Implementation Vendor on February 26, 2009. Caltrans received, reviewed and signed the contract on February 27, 2009. DGS Legal reviewed and signed the contract on March 5th, 2009.
Is a detailed written scope of work for all services included in solicitation documents?	X		Detailed written scope of work is contained in the RFP.

Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Are detailed requirement specifications included in solicitation documents?	X		Detailed requirement specifications are contained in the RFP. Requirements are described in the RFQI and Value Analysis documents.
Is there material participation of outside expertise (e.g. DGS, Departmental specialists, consultants) in procurement planning and execution?	X		Outside expertise and counsel has been sought from DOF, DGS, and consultants.
For large-scale outsourcing, is qualified legal counsel obtained?	N/A	N/A	The project does not involve outsourcing as currently defined.
Risk Management			
Is formal continuous risk management performed, including development of a written risk management plan, identification, analysis, mitigation and escalation of risks in accordance with DOF/TOSU Guidelines, and regular management team review of risks and mitigation progress performed?	X		The latest version of the Risk Management Plan was submitted April 30, 2009. Risk owners have been assigned. A Risk Register was developed and is tracked by the Risk Manager.
Does the management team review risks and mitigation progress at least monthly?	X		Risk management sessions are being held regularly with the team during the procurement phase.
Are externally developed risk identification aids used, such as the SEI Taxonomy Based Questionnaire?	X		A risk list was initially populated using the SEI Risk Taxonomy. Additional risks are added to the list through input or migration from the issue list.
Communication			
Is there a written project communications plan?	X		The Communication Plan was updated to reflect the new organization and implementation strategy. The updated Communication Plan is dated November 2008. A new draft PRSM Communications Matrix was sent out on April 30, 2009 for review.
Are regular written status reports prepared and provided to the project manager, department CIO (if applicable) and other key stakeholders?	X		The Advisory Committee receives a written status report during the monthly Advisory Committee meetings. These reports include issues identified, changes to scope, schedule, cost, problems encountered, and items accomplished.
Are there written escalation policies for issues and risks?	X		Both the Risk Management Plan and the Issue Management Plan contain a risk escalation process.
Is there regular stakeholder involvement in major project decisions, issue resolution and risk mitigation?	X		Implementation Manager meetings occur on a monthly basis. The purpose of this meeting is to keep the District project managers regularly updated on the status of the project and to receive their input.
System Engineering			
Are users involved throughout the project, especially in requirements specification and testing?	X		Representatives of key stakeholder groups participated in and reviewed the Value Analysis Report that describes the PRSM requirements. The PRSM Project Team is being run by Caltrans Division of Project management which is the primary constituency for the system.
Do users formally approve/sign-off on written specifications?	X		The PRSM Advisory Committee is comprised of Caltrans personnel. The Advisory Committee appears to be monitoring the initial planning process. This level of involvement appears to be appropriate for the current phase of the project.

Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Is a formal SDLC methodology followed?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase and this item will be assessed as the Configuration Management Plan and new WBS is near completion.
Is a software product used to assist in managing requirements? Is there tracking of requirements traceability through all life-cycle phases?	X		An Implementation and System Acceptance Test consultant has been added to the team. The level of requirements management presently in place appears to be appropriate for the current phase of the project.
Do software engineering standards exist and are they followed?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase
Does product defect tracking begin no later than requirements specifications?	X		The PRSM issue management system currently is designed to serve as a defect tracking mechanism. Several of the issues already raised represent clarification to requirements.
Are formal code reviews conducted?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase
Are formal quality assurance procedures followed consistently?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase
Do users sign-off on acceptance test results before a new system or changes are put into production?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase
Is the enterprise architecture plan adhered to?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase and this item will be assessed as the plans are near completion.
Are formal deliverable inspections performed, beginning with requirements specifications?	X		During the Planning Phase, the Implementation Vendor is reviewing the requirements and will be working with Caltrans to create a requirements clarification report. Previously, the requirements have been through two separate review activities: user group review and IV&V review. There is a third review underway by the Project Management team in order to document the As-Is and To-Be business processes. IPOC will continue to monitor this area as the project progresses.
Are IV&V services obtained and used?	X		The IV&V Contract was approved and the IV&V vendor began work in April 2008.

IPO Report for March 2008

Independent Project Oversight Report

Project Name: Caltrans PRSM

Assessment Date: Mar 31, 2009

Frequency: Monthly

Oversight Provider Information

Oversight Leader: Greg Thomas

Organization: Deloitte & Touche LLP

Phone Number: 916 288 3232

Email: grethomas@deloitte.com

Project Information

Project Number: 2660-160

Department: Transportation (Caltrans)

Criticality: High

Agency: Business, Transportation & Housing

Last Approved Document/Date: SPR (09/29/08)

Total One-time Cost: \$25,544,000

Start Date: June 7, 2000

End Date: May, 2011

Project Manager: David Youmans

Organization: Caltrans

Phone Number: 916.826.4425

Email: david_youmans@dot.ca.gov

Summary: Current Status

Project Phase: Planning

Planned Start Date: September 2, 2008

Planned End Date: October 6, 2008

Actual Start Date: March 5, 2009

Forecasted End Date: May, 2009

Schedule

Select the statement that most closely applies, measured against the last **Finance approved** document.

Ahead-of-schedule:

One or more major tasks or milestones have been completed and approved early (> 5%).
All other major tasks and milestones completed and approved according to plan.

On Schedule

On-schedule:

All major tasks and milestones have been completed and approved according to plan.
(Within 5%)

Behind Schedule:

One or more major tasks or milestones are expected to be delayed. (> 5%)

Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Comments:

A new baseline schedule was set with the approved SPR dated September 29, 2008. The final contract was signed by the Implementation Vendor on February 26, 2009. Caltrans received, reviewed and signed the contract on February 27, 2009. DGS Legal reviewed and signed the contract on March 5th, 2009. The implementation vendor kick-off meeting was held on March 9, 2009. During the kick-off meeting, the PRSM Project Team provided the implementation vendor with overviews of the current PRSM project management plans. An updated SPR with a new baseline is being drafted. Caltrans is meeting with the OCIO to discuss the updated SPR's content.

Resources (Level of Effort) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Fewer Resources

Completion of one or more major tasks and/or acceptable products has required or is expected to require materially (>5%) fewer hours/staff than planned.

Within Resources

All major tasks have been completed and acceptable products created using the planned number of hours/staff (within 5%).

More Resources

Completion of major tasks and/or acceptable products has required or is expected to require materially (>5%) more hours/staff than planned.

Within Resources

Comments: A new baseline was set with the approved SPR.

Resources (Budget/Cost) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Less cost

The project is (>5%) under budget.

Within cost

The project is operating within budget.

Higher cost

Material budget increases (>5%) are likely.

Within Cost

Comments: A new baseline was set with the approved SPR.

Quality (Client Functionality) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Adequately Defined

Required client functionality is adequately defined, and is being successfully built into the system, given the current project phase.

Inadequately Defined

One or more significant components of required client functionality are inadequately defined, or are not being successfully built into the system, given the current project phase.

Adequately Defined

Comments: Functionality is adequately defined for the Planning Phase which began on March 5. The Implementation Vendor is currently reviewing the requirements and will be working with Caltrans to create a requirements clarification report, which is due to be completed in April, 2009.

Quality (Architecture/System Performance) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Adequately Defined

The system technical architecture is adequately defined, and modeling, benchmarking and testing are being conducted (or are planned) appropriate to the current project phase.

Adequately Defined

Inadequately Defined

The system technical architecture is not adequately defined, or modeling, benchmarking and testing are not being conducted (or are planned) appropriate to the current project phase.

Comments: System technical architecture and performance are adequately defined for the Planning Phase. The Implementation Vendor is working with Caltrans to create a Configuration Management Plan and High Level Design. Caltrans and the Implementation Vendor are working with DTS to configure the development, testing and training environments. As the project progresses, additional refinement may be necessary.

New Risks

No new risks this month.

Progress Toward Addressing Prior Risks

Risk Title: Resource Availability

Risk Statement: Without adequate Caltrans resources working on PRSM, the project implementation schedule could be delayed. While in the Planning Phase, some of the PRSM Project Team members are allocated part time. The resource needs are likely to change when the project shifts to the implementation phase.

Probability: Medium Impact: High Time Frame: Short Severity: High Assigned to: TBD

Recommendations:

- After the PRSM work plan is complete, determine the resource gaps and reallocate effort as appropriate.

Status Update:

March 09 Status: The PRSM Project Team WBS work plan comments and feedback continue to be collected and reviewed. The PRSM Publicity/Risk Manager has left the project team and a replacement has not yet been identified.

Feb 09 Status: The PRSM Project Team WBS work plan comments and feedback continue to be collected and reviewed. The draft WBS work plan is scheduled to be completed in March.

Risk Title: Business Process Changes

Risk Statement: The impact of business changes resulting from the PRSM implementation needs to be sufficiently understood, planned for, and communicated to Caltrans staff. If this is not addressed, the project rollout could result in disruption to the business processes and create issues regarding the perceived quality of PRSM. This could result in increased resistance to acceptance and usage of the system.

Probability: High Impact: High Time Frame: Med Severity: High Assigned to: David Cordone

Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Recommendations:

- Implement a formal change management process which will be used for PRSM project related changes. Change management tasks associated with these changes should be incorporated into the project schedule and budget. Changes should be communicated to the key stakeholders.

Status Update:

March 09 Status: The business project managers have reported that the draft business process documentation was sent to the Districts for review. District feedback has been collected and the project team is now in the process of incorporating the District's comments. Once District comments have been incorporated, the documentation will go through a Management review.

Feb 09 Status: The business project managers have reported that District feedback for the implementation challenges document is still being collected and organized. This process is estimated to be completed in March. In addition, two initiatives have begun to address key implementation challenges: Task Management and PRSM Reporting.

Risk Title: Business Rules

Risk Statement: If District field staff are not in agreement with the decisions and consequences of changing/standardizing business rules, it may have an adverse effect on system acceptance and may disrupt work in progress. If PRSM intends to standardize business rules, the decisions and consequences of changing/standardizing business rules should be documented, communicated, clearly understood and agreed to by the Districts prior to implementation.

Probability: High Impact: High Time Frame: Med Severity: High Assigned to: David Cordone

Recommendations:

- Define the process for gaining field consensus on the new business rules.
- Develop a plan that describes how information on new business rules will be communicated to the field with sufficient time to get feedback and buy-in. This business rule information should inform test case development.

Status Update:

March 09 Status: The business project managers have reported that the draft business process documentation was sent to the Districts for review. District feedback has been collected and the project team is now in the process of incorporating the District's comments. Once District comments have been incorporated, the documentation will go through a Management review

Feb 09 Status: District feedback for the implementation challenges document is still being collected and organized. This process is estimated to be completed in March. In addition, two initiatives have begun to address key implementation challenges: Task Management and PRSM Reporting.

Risk Title: Procurement Delays

Risk Statement: Delays in the State procurement process and decision-making will likely impact the schedule. The delays could lead to higher vendor costs and higher project costs. Delays in the future may result in changes to the PRSM interfaces given the implementation schedule of other systems (i.e. Enterprise Resource Planning Financial Infrastructure project (EFIS)).

Probability: High Impact: High Time Frame: Short Severity: High Assigned to: Jacquelyn Moore

Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Recommendations:

- Significant procurement milestones should be isolated and brought to the attention of DGS, Finance, the Legislature and senior Caltrans management.
- Additional activity times should be added to the schedule. Timeframes can be estimated based on recent experience with the various procurement and control agencies. Schedule plans should reflect the lengthy review, rework and coordination tasks among involved entities.
- Clear ownership of individual procurement activities with responsibility for tracking and monitoring the procurement through the process.
- An escalation plan should be developed so that delays are quickly identified and communicated.
- Where feasible, the project should seek increased delegation authority from DGS and Caltrans Headquarters.

Status Update:

March 09 Status: The final contract was signed by the Implementation Vendor on February 26, 2009. Caltrans received, reviewed and signed the contract on February 27, 2009. DGS Legal reviewed and signed the contract on March 5th, 2009. The implementation vendor kick-off meeting was held on March 9, 2009. During the kick-off meeting, the PRSM Project Team provided the implementation vendor with overviews of the current PRSM project management plans. Since the contract with the Implementation Vendor has been executed and the vendor is now on board, this is no longer a risk for the PRSM project and will be removed from the IPOR going forward.

Feb 09 Status: The final contract was sent to Implementation Vendor for signature. Implementation Vendor signed the contract on February 26, 2009. Caltrans received, reviewed and signed the contract on February 27, 2009. DGS Legal is currently conducting the final review of the Implementation Vendor contract. Once the Implementation Vendor contract is signed by DGS, the Software Vendor contract will be signed. Caltrans expects signatures and execution of both contracts (Implementation Vendor and Software Vendor) the week of March 7, 2009.

General Comments

Deloitte & Touche LLP's IPOC contract with the Caltrans PRSM project started in December 2008. This Independent Project Oversight Report (IPOR) provided by Deloitte & Touche LLP has been developed in accordance with the applicable standards of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) as per Deloitte & Touche LLP policy.

IPOC has attended various PRSM project meetings throughout the month of March, including various meetings during the PRSM kick-off week with the Implementation Vendor, PRSM Implementation Managers meeting, PRSM Status meetings, and the PRSM Advisory Committee meeting.

At the end of this reporting period, the PRSM project is in the Planning Phase of the project. Three deliverables have been identified to be completed during the Planning Phase: the Implementation Plan, Training Plan, and Configuration Management Plan. IPOC will review each of the plans and provide comments after they have been drafted.

Project Oversight Review Checklist for March 2009

Project Oversight Review Checklist: High Criticality Project

This checklist is an assessment for the Planning Phase. The end date of this phase is May 2009.

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Planning and Tracking			
Have the business case, project goals, objectives, expected outcomes, key stakeholders, and sponsor(s) identified and documented?	X		The SPR was approved by the OCIO on September 29, 2008. The Section 11 was submitted and the waiting period ended Dec 5. The appropriate project documents should be updated with the new information from the SPR and Implementation Vendor information.
Has a detailed project plan with all activities (tasks), milestones, dates, and estimated hours by task loaded into project management (PM) software? Are the lowest level tasks of a short duration with measurable outcomes?	X		During the Planning Phase, the Implementation Vendor is working with Caltrans to update the detailed project plan in MS Project to more accurately reflect and track project tasks, milestones, dates, and estimated hours. A WBS/task list of approximately 2,000 items exists in an Excel file. This task list / work plan is currently being used to track tasks, estimated hours, dependencies, and resources. These activities are appropriate for the Planning Phase of the project.
Is completion of planned tasks recorded within the PM software?	X		During the Planning Phase, the Implementation Vendor is working with Caltrans to update the detailed project plan in MS Project to more accurately track completion of planned tasks. This is appropriate for the Planning Phase of the project.
Are actual hours expended by task recorded at least monthly within PM software?	X		Actual hours are charged to a WBS number and are recorded and tracked in the Department's official accounting system.
Are estimated hours to complete by task recorded at least monthly within PM software?		X	Estimated hours to complete are currently not being recorded within PM software. A draft WBS work plan is being created which will be used going forward to track tasks, estimated hours, dependencies, and resources. The PRSM Project Team is planning to use the PM software that was proposed in the Implementation Vendor's contract (MS Project).
Is there a formal staffing plan, including a current organization chart, written roles and responsibilities, plans for staff acquisition, schedule for arrival and departure of specific staff, and staff training plans		X	The project organization has changed and applicable documents should be updated.
Have project cost estimates, with supporting data for each cost category, been maintained?	X		The latest approved SPR dated September 29, 2008 has reset the baseline.
Are software size estimates developed and tracked?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase and this item will be assessed as the new WBS is developed.
Are two or more estimation approaches used to refine estimates?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase and this item will be assessed as the new WBS is developed.
Are independent reviews of estimates conducted?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase and this item will be assessed as the new WBS is developed.
Are actual costs recorded and regularly compared to budgeted costs?	X		A spreadsheet exists that shows planned and actual costs by month.

Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Is supporting data maintained for actual costs?	X		Actual costs are obtained from timesheets that allocate time to WBS numbers/tasks.
Is completion status of work plan activities, deliverables, and milestones recorded, compared to schedule and included in a written status reporting process?	X		High-level work plan activity completion is reported in status meetings and is documented in Excel. The Implementation Vendor is currently working with Caltrans to update the detailed project plan in MS Project. This plan will be used to track completion of activities, deliverables, and milestones. A high-level status report is posted on the Caltrans Improvement Project web database. Status reports go to the Legislature quarterly.
Are key specification documents (e.g. contracts, requirement specifications and/or contract deliverables) and software products under formal configuration control, with items to be controlled and specific staff roles and responsibilities for configuration management identified in a configuration management plan?	X		The development of the Configuration Management Plan is a deliverable that will be created in the Planning Phase. Currently, the vendor and Caltrans are working together to develop this plan. Once the Configuration Management Plan is drafted, IPOC will review the plan and provide comments.
Are issues/problems and their resolution (including assignment of specific staff responsibility for issue resolution and specific deadlines for completion of resolution activities), formally tracked?	X		An Issue Management Plan was approved and open issues are in the project database. The IT project manager is considering the same tool for managing project changes. Additionally, Caltrans has established an Issues Management Meeting that is held on a monthly basis.
Is user satisfaction assessed at key project milestones?	X		Representatives of the engineering areas and regions participated in the vendor demonstration evaluations. This is adequate for the Planning Phase of the project.
Is planning in compliance with formal standards or a system development life-cycle (SDLC) methodology?	X		Compliance with PMBOK standards is adequate for this phase of the project. Three deliverables have been identified to be completed during the Planning Phase: the Implementation Plan, Training Plan, and Configuration Management Plan.
Is there formal enterprise architecture in place?	X		The RFQI describes the target Caltrans enterprise environment.
Are project closeout activities performed, including a PIER, collection and archiving up-to-date project records and identification of lessons learned?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase.
Procurement			
Are appropriate procurement vehicles selected (e.g. CMAS, MSA, "alternative procurement") and their required processes followed?	X		The final contract was signed by the Implementation Vendor on February 26, 2009. Caltrans received, reviewed and signed the contract on February 27, 2009. DGS Legal reviewed and signed the contract on March 5th, 2009.
Is a detailed written scope of work for all services included in solicitation documents?	X		Detailed written scope of work is contained in the RFP.
Are detailed requirement specifications included in solicitation documents?	X		Detailed requirement specifications are contained in the RFP. Requirements are described in the RFQI and Value Analysis documents.
Is there material participation of outside expertise (e.g. DGS, Departmental specialists, consultants) in procurement planning and execution?	X		Outside expertise and counsel has been sought from DOF, DGS, and consultants.
For large-scale outsourcing, is qualified legal counsel obtained?	N/A	N/A	The project does not involve outsourcing as currently defined.
Risk Management			

Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Is formal continuous risk management performed, including development of a written risk management plan, identification, analysis, mitigation and escalation of risks in accordance with DOF/TOSU Guidelines, and regular management team review of risks and mitigation progress performed?	X		The latest version of the Risk Management Plan was submitted March 28. Risk owners have been assigned. A Risk Register was developed and is tracked by the Risk Manager.
Does the management team review risks and mitigation progress at least monthly?	X		Risk management sessions are being held regularly with the team during the procurement phase.
Are externally developed risk identification aids used, such as the SEI Taxonomy Based Questionnaire?	X		A risk list was initially populated using the SEI Risk Taxonomy. Additional risks are added to the list through input or migration from the issue list.
Communication			
Is there a written project communications plan?	X		The Communication Plan was updated to reflect the new organization and implementation strategy. The updated Communication Plan is dated November 2008.
Are regular written status reports prepared and provided to the project manager, department CIO (if applicable) and other key stakeholders?	X		The Advisory Committee receives a written status report during the monthly Advisory Committee meetings. These reports include issues identified, changes to scope, schedule, cost, problems encountered, and items accomplished.
Are there written escalation policies for issues and risks?	X		Both the Risk Management Plan and the Issue Management Plan contain a risk escalation process.
Is there regular stakeholder involvement in major project decisions, issue resolution and risk mitigation?	X		Implementation Manager meetings occur on a monthly basis. The purpose of this meeting is to keep the District project managers regularly updated on the status of the project and to receive their input.
System Engineering			
Are users involved throughout the project, especially in requirements specification and testing?	X		Representatives of key stakeholder groups participated in and reviewed the Value Analysis Report that describes the PRSM requirements. The PRSM Project Team is being run by Caltrans Division of Project management which is the primary constituency for the system.
Do users formally approve/sign-off on written specifications?	X		The PRSM Advisory Committee is comprised of Caltrans personnel. The Advisory Committee appears to be monitoring the initial planning process. This level of involvement appears to be appropriate for the current phase of the project.
Is a formal SDLC methodology followed?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase and this item will be assessed as the Configuration Management Plan and new WBS is near completion.
Is a software product used to assist in managing requirements? Is there tracking of requirements traceability through all life-cycle phases?	X		An Implementation and System Acceptance Test consultant has been added to the team. The level of requirements management presently in place appears to be appropriate for the current phase of the project.
Do software engineering standards exist and are they followed?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase
Does product defect tracking begin no later than requirements specifications?	X		The PRSM issue management system currently is designed to serve as a defect tracking mechanism. Several of the issues already raised represent clarification to requirements.
Are formal code reviews conducted?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Are formal quality assurance procedures followed consistently?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase
Do users sign-off on acceptance test results before a new system or changes are put into production?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase
Is the enterprise architecture plan adhered to?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase and this item will be assessed as the plans are near completion.
Are formal deliverable inspections performed, beginning with requirements specifications?	X		During the Planning Phase, the Implementation Vendor is reviewing the requirements and will be working with Caltrans to create a requirements clarification report. Previously, the requirements have been through two separate review activities: user group review and IV&V review. There is a third review underway by the Project Management team in order to document the As-Is and To-Be business processes. IPOC will continue to monitor this area as the project progresses.
Are IV&V services obtained and used?	X		The IV&V Contract was approved and the IV&V vendor began work in April 2008.